



## **AGENDA**

### **Citizens' Advisory Committee**

**7:00 P.M. - 9:00 P.M.**

**January 9, 2013**

**Maple Grove Government Center - Room 183**

- A. Call to Order by Chair
- B. Oath of Office for Reappointed Members
- C. Minutes: Approve Minutes from November 14, 2012
- D. Area Reports (Forms in Packet)
- E. Discuss Options for a 2013 Community Survey
- F. Other Business and Updates
- G. Adjournment

## **Oath of Office**

## Minutes

## **Maple Grove Citizens Advisory Committee**

### **Meeting Minutes**

**November 14, 2012**

<b>Call to Order</b>	The meeting was called to order at 7:04 p.m. by CAC Co-Chair Bob Joiner at the Maple Grove Government Center		
<b>Members Present</b>	Stephen Gill Tim Klevar Joan Masberg	Lorraine Gresser Pam Larson Kevin Rebman	Bob Joiner Steven Maas Don Skoglund
<b>Members Absent</b>	John Beacham, Leslie Bender, Linda Furst, Greg Hulne, Harry Kennedy, Joe Picket.		
<b>Others Present</b>	Councilmember Phil Leith, City Administrator Al Madsen, and CAC City Staff Liaison Mike Opatz.		
<b>Minutes</b>	The minutes for the October 10, 2012 regular CAC meeting were approved.		
<b>Introduction</b>	The high school students and scout troop in attendance introduced themselves. Co-Chair Joiner provided a brief overview of the CAC to the guests.		
<b>Area Reports</b>	<p>As a follow up to discussion at the October CAC meeting, Lorraine Gresser stated there is no nursing home in Maple Grove. Rose Arbor is assisted living. The City may wish to consider a nursing home as an additional way to create jobs.</p> <p>A thank you was offered for the completion of the Bass Lake Road and Weaver Lake Road expansion projects.</p>		
<b>Role and Purpose of CAC Discussion</b>	<p>City Administrator Al Madsen distributed a memo dated November 14, 2012 in response to some of the questions that arose out of the October 10, 2012 CAC meeting. He reviewed the various aspects of the memo and the following points and discussion ensued from those:</p> <p>Mr. Madsen talked about the land use plans for the City—both for the gravel mining area and the City overall. With regard to the Gravel Mining Area land use plan, Councilmember Leith stated that taller buildings and office campuses are part of the future plans.</p> <p>The question was asked about additional medical development in the area of the hospital. It was mentioned the hospital is considering developing a medical/office building separate from the hospital itself.</p> <p>The question was posed to Mr. Madsen as to what he thought the City's biggest weakness was. He stated that five years ago he would have said</p>		

transportation, but that is not the case today. Several items that he mentioned are:

- Tax abatement/incentives/tax increment financing—he stated these have not been standard practice for Maple Grove.
- Special legislation for TIF district in the Gravel Mining Area. This legislation was part of a bigger bill vetoed by the Governor in 2012. The City expects that legislation to be coming back in 2013.
- High cost of development in Gravel Mining Area.
- Completion of 610.

The question was asked if there is a role the CAC can play in the completion of Highway 610. Suggestions included: letters to Washington politicians, state reps, senators, and the governor. In addition, CAC could adopt a resolution.

Two suggestions were made of areas that CAC could consider involvement:

- Citizen survey
- Basketball facility proposal by OMGBA

The CAC could play a project management/overview role as was done with the sports dome and second sheet of ice.

The statement was made that it is healthy and important to have consistent and continued citizen involvement and input.

Discussion took place on a wards system as well as a primary election for Council candidates. It was mentioned that a wards system would require a restructure of the City governance, and that it was not well received when reviewed/discussed previously. The question was asked if the City Council had an interest in a primary for Council seats. It was stated there would be added costs for staff, election judges to include that in the primary.

Mention was made of a joint meeting with the City Council and Citizens Advisory Committee to discuss items in which the CAC could be involved. It was stated that an agenda would be needed and mention was made of a creating a subcommittee for setting an agenda.

Mr. Madsen talked about the Economic Development Commission and the role it played in the City. While it is not active and hasn't been for a number of years, the EDC has not been disbanded.

Question was brought up about what role the Council wants CAC to play. It was stated that more of an exploratory role in projects.

Mr. Madsen stated that if CAC is running out of things, they should stop meeting or meet as needed.

Mention was again made of the citizen survey as well as the basketball facility for which a proposal is expected. The suggestion was made for CAC to make a list of things to review and address and give a presentation to the City Council.

Discussion took place on the Osseo Maple Grove Basketball Association project for additional gym space for basketball practice, games and tournaments.

The question was asked about any plans for a convention center and discussion ensued. The Reflections project proposal included a convention center, but that project went nowhere. Convention centers that were mentioned included those in Brooklyn Center, Rochester, and St. Cloud.

Mr. Madsen reviewed the Silvercrest Properties development planned for 2013—senior housing and different levels of care and services.

CAC outlined the following next steps:

1. Move forward with citizen survey; ask the City Council to get approval for survey.
2. Address the OMGBA proposed facility when the time is appropriate.
3. Look at other topics; visit with Council.

Mention was made that several “techy” CAC members visit with the City’s GIS Administrator Mike Eberle to review the City’s work with fiber optics technology. Discussed ensued on fiber optics and it is a big plus to the City, particularly for attracting business development.

Discussion continued on the proposed citizen survey, such as the format—online, phone, cell phone. National Research Center was used for the last survey, and they set up the survey/results/benchmarks that it would work well to continue to work with them into the future. The question was asked if a Request for Proposal would be needed.

Motion made to ask the City Council’s permission to address and proceed with a citizen survey in 2013. Motion seconded. 9 ayes; no nays.

The next meeting for the CAC will be January 9, 2013.

**Other Business/  
Updates**

The comment was made that the elections went very well, and the judges were well trained. Deputy City Clerk Stevie Koll Anderson and her election staff are to be commended.

The following projects were mentioned/briefly discussed:

- Redstone restaurant opening late November.
- Whole Foods Market should open in 2013.
- Whirlyball.
- Goodwill second location.
- Hospital expansion almost complete.
- Aldi started construction.
- Spire credit union project is moving along well.
- Chick-fil-a still coming.
- Z's Smokin' Bonez.
- Multi-tenant facility in Wedgewood Commerce Center.
- Financing package for grocery store/housing in southwest Maple Grove.

The meeting adjourned at 8:55 p.m.

**Adjournment**

Respectfully submitted,

Carol Morris  
Minute Secretary

## **2013 Community Survey**



**TO:** CAC Members

**FROM:** Mike Opatz, CAC Staff Liaison

**DATE:** January 2, 2013

**SUBJECT:** 2013 Community Survey

The CAC will be undertaking another community survey in 2013 as the last one was conducted in 2008. The City has requested a proposal from National Research Center (NRC), which was the survey consultant for the 2008 survey. The proposals will give the City some options to consider on ways to conduct survey.

The survey for the most part should be similar in terms of questions and size as we want to track the responses to the same questions from 2008. We may drop a few questions and add some new ones. However, the overall review process of the survey questions should be much less intensive compared to 2008.

The proposal from NRC is expected to arrive on January 7, so copies will be brought to the meeting. City staff is working on having NRC staff available via a phone conference to discuss the proposal.

Attached are the key documents from the 2008 survey.

January 7, 2008

DATE

REQUEST FOR COUNCIL ACTION

AGENDA ITEM NUMBER

ORIGINATING DEPARTMENT

AGENDA ITEM

CITY ADMINISTRATOR'S  
APPROVAL

Administration

Community Survey Consultant Award

---

**PREVIOUS ACTIONS:**

This agenda item was tabled by the City Council on December 3, 2007.

---

**RECOMMENDED COUNCIL ACTION:**

Motion by the Mayor and City Council to award the community survey consultant project to National Research Center in an amount not to exceed \$24,496. Motion is subject to the City Attorney drafting an agreement for execution by all parties involved.

---

**COMMENTS**

The Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) has been directed by Mayor Steffenson to work on a community survey. The last city survey was a mail survey in October 2001. The CAC has reviewed the previous survey questions and results, and have determined that a phone survey is the best method for the upcoming survey.

In September 2007 a Request For Proposals was released by City staff to solicit a survey consultant that would assist the CAC in the design of the survey. The consultant would also conduct the survey, tabulate the results, and issue a final report. A total of five proposals were received. **Exhibit A** provides a summary of the five proposals.

The CAC formed a five member subcommittee to review and evaluate the five proposals. An evaluation matrix was used to score the five proposals based on the criteria listed in the RFP. Attached is the completed evaluation matrix. The top two scoring firms, National Research Center and MarketLine, were invited for oral interviews with the full CAC on November 14, 2007. Following the interviews, the CAC members discussed the pros and cons of both firms. The CAC passed a motion to recommend that National Research Center (NRC) be recommended to the City Council as the firm to award the community survey consultant project. NRC was deemed to have more experience with similar "city" projects. NRC has greater ability to conduct normative comparisons with similar cities across the nation than its in-state competitor (MarketLine). Overall, it was felt that NRC proposal represented the best value to the City. The motion included that City staff request a best and final offer from NRC to include the \$1,100 optional service from their proposal titled "Normative Comparisons" in the base price. NRC has agreed to this.

NRC is based in Boulder Colorado, but has worked on several similar projects in Minnesota. Positive references were received from the Minnesota clients of NRC. NRC will be required to make up to four on site meetings with the CAC to design the survey. NRC will also be required to meet with the City Council to present the final questions before the survey is conducted and then again to make a final report presentation following the completion of the survey.

## **Exhibit A**

### **Summary of Consultant Proposals**

#### **Proposal Summary: Anderson, Niebuhr, and Associates, INC**

- Arden Hills, MN
- 30 years of experience
- Well organized and detailed proposal
- Uses computer-assisted telephone (CATI) / Has its own call center
- 15 minutes per survey / three open ended questions
- 14-week timeline
- ***Proposed Cost = \$31,000***

#### **National Research Center**

- Boulder, CO
- 16 years of experience
- 15 minutes per survey
- Contracted with ICMA to offer “*The National Citizen Survey*”
- Well organized and detailed proposal
- Uses computer-assisted telephone (CATI) / Contracts for a call center
- 14-week timeline
- ***Proposed Cost = \$24,496***

#### **Proposal Summary: Information Specialist Group, Inc.**

- Eden Prairie, MN
- 13 years of experience
- Has a Public Sector Division
- Uses computer-assisted telephone (CATI) / Has its own call center
- Proposal has a good level of details.
- 30 minute survey
- Six to nine week timeline
- ***Proposed Cost = \$18,900***

#### **Molgren Research Associates**

- Media, MN
- Established in 1950
- Proposal is light on details
- Timeline is nine weeks
- ***Proposed Cost = \$17,800***

#### **MarketLine Research, Inc**

- Minneapolis, MN
- 12 years of experience
- President is a Maple Grove resident
- Uses computer-assisted telephone (CATI)
- Well organized and detailed proposal
- Value-added enhancement / benchmarking
- Timeline is 10 to 12 weeks
- Proposed Cost = \$15,500

June 2, 2008  
**DATE**

**REQUEST FOR COUNCIL ACTION**

**AGENDA ITEM NUMBER**

**ORIGINATING DEPARTMENT**

**AGENDA ITEM**

**CITY ADMINISTRATOR'S**  
**APPROVAL**

Administration

2008 Citizen Survey Report Presentation

---

**PREVIOUS ACTIONS:**

On January 7, 2008, the Mayor and City Council awarded the community survey consultant project to National Research Center in an amount not to exceed \$24,496.

---

**RECOMMENDED COUNCIL ACTION:**

Motion by the Mayor and City Council to accept the 2008 Citizen Survey Report as prepared by National Research Center.

---

**COMMENTS**

Shannon Hayden from National Research Center (NRC) will present the Executive Summary of the 2008 Citizen Survey Report, which includes the following information:

- The 2008 Citizen Survey provided residents the opportunity to rate the quality of life in the City of Maple Grove, as well as the service delivery and overall workings of local government. The survey also permitted residents to provide feedback to government on what is working well and what is not and share their priorities for community planning and resource allocation. Telephone interviewing of randomly selected resident households was from conducted from March 31 to April 21, 2008. A total of 401 telephone interviews were completed, with a response rate of 35%.
- Survey results were weighted so that respondent age, gender and housing tenure (rent or own) were represented in proportions reflective of the entire city. The margin of error is plus or minus five percentage points around any given percentage point reported for the entire sample. Because Maple Grove has administered a resident survey before, some comparisons could be made between 2008 responses and those from 2001. Maple Grove also elected to have its results compared to those of other jurisdictions around the nation, comparisons made possible through a national benchmark database created and maintained NRC. This database contains resident perspectives gathered in citizen surveys from approximately 500 jurisdictions. Benchmark comparisons in this report are made to all other jurisdictions in the NRC database. *(Note: Per the request of City Administrator Madsen, a benchmark report is also being prepared using 73 jurisdictions that have a population range of 45,000 to 75,000 to more closely relate to Maple Grove's population of 61,000. This report should be available on June 2, 2008.)*
- Overall, ratings of Maple Grove were high, with most residents reporting a good quality of life and positive feelings toward the city as a whole. Survey results indicated that most residents value a wide variety of aspects of life in Maple Grove and the services being provided to them by the City. Many ratings of city characteristics and services in Maple Grove were above ratings given by residents in other jurisdictions around the nation.



The 2008 Citizen Survey provided Maple Grove residents the opportunity to rate the quality of life in the City, service delivery and overall workings of local government. It also permitted residents to provide feedback on priorities for community planning and resource allocation. Telephone interviewing was from conducted from March 31 to April 21, 2008. A total of 401 telephone interviews were completed from March 31 through April 21, 2008. Maple Grove also elected to have its results compared to those of other jurisdictions around the nation.

Overall, ratings of Maple Grove were high, with most residents reporting a good quality of life and positive feelings toward the city as a whole. Survey results indicated that most residents value a wide variety of aspects of life in Maple Grove and the services being provided to them by the City. Many ratings of city characteristics and services in Maple Grove were above ratings given by residents in other jurisdictions around the nation. Residents expressed less enthusiasm regarding Maple Grove's openness to citizen perspectives and the perceived value for taxes paid, as these items received ratings below the national benchmark. Residents shared their priorities for development in Maple Grove.

### *Quality of Life*

The majority of respondents to the 2008 survey rated four dimensions of quality of life in Maple Grove as "good" or better, although those who had lived in Maple Grove for 10 years or less rated some aspects of quality of life lower than did those who had lived in the City more than 10 years. Overall quality of life, as well as Maple Grove as a place to raise children and to work was all rated above the national benchmark. Overall quality of life and the city as a place to raise children remained stable between 2001 and 2008. When asked to rate the quality of various community characteristics in Maple Grove, respondents generally gave positive ratings, with at least half of them rating most characteristics as "good" or better. The highest rating went to the cleanliness of Maple Grove. The majority of respondents also thought highly of the overall quality of business in the city, recreational opportunities, the availability of paths and walking trails and the city's overall image.



Half of the community characteristics listed on the survey received ratings higher than the national benchmark: city cleanliness, recreational opportunities, availability of paths, the city's image, availability of quality healthcare, housing options, natural area preservation, employment opportunities and ease of bike travel. Six of the remaining nine characteristics were rated similarly to jurisdictions across the country. Ease of car travel in the city was given a rating that was lower than the national benchmark, but 6 out of 10 respondents reported that ease of car travel was "good" or better in Maple Grove. Ratings in 2008 were stable compared

to 2001, with ease of bike travel rated slightly higher in 2008.

When asked to prioritize various aspects of the community that contribute to it being a quality place to live, a strong majority of respondents rated community safety and neighborhood quality as "very important" or "essential." At least three-quarters of those surveyed viewed schools, housing, open spaces and parks and the cost of housing as "very important" or "essential." Longer-term residents were less likely to feel that the quality of schools was important to the quality of life in the city than were shorter-term residents. Shorter-term residents, on the other hand, were less likely to rate ease of travel in the city and its small-town feel as important.

In both 2001 and 2008, traffic congestion was named most frequently as the biggest challenge facing Maple Grove. Almost all residents reported feeling safe in most areas of Maple Grove. Maple Grove residents felt safer than do residents in other jurisdictions across the country. The vast majority of respondents said they would recommend living in Maple Grove and are likely to remain in Maple Grove for the next five years.

### *City Services*

In 2008, residents were asked to rate the overall quality of services provided by the City. A large majority described the overall quality of City services as "good" or better, a rating that placed Maple Grove higher than the national benchmark. All City services received ratings of "good" or better by half or more of respondents. Many services received these high ratings by a large majority of surveyed residents. These higher rated services were city parks and trails, recycling, the community center, fire services, police services and recreation programs. Maple Grove exceeded the national benchmark for 13 of 23 services. Those services rated above the benchmark average



included: city parks and trails; recycling; the community center; recreation programs; youth services; crime prevention; animal control; sidewalk maintenance; street lighting; code enforcement; transit services; street maintenance; and land use, planning and zoning. Eight services received service ratings that were similar to other jurisdictions across the country. These were police services, sewer services, athletic fields, traffic enforcement, snow removal, drinking water, senior services and traffic signal timing. Only fire services and fire prevention and education were rated below the national benchmark. Service ratings were largely similar to those given in 2001, where comparisons were available. In 2008, residents living in Maple Grove for 10 years or less tended to give lower ratings than did those who reported living in the city for more than 10 years.



Maple Grove residents were asked their opinions about the quality of City planning. At least half of respondents gave a rating of “good” or better to each aspect of planning listed. Planning for retail areas received a “very good” rating by half of the survey’s respondents. A large majority reported that planning for parks, trails, sidewalks, and community events were “good” or better. Residents’ ratings of planning for residential areas improved from 2001.

### *Government Performance*

Three-quarters of respondents rated the overall direction that Maple Grove is taking as “good” or better, placing it similar to the ratings received by other jurisdictions in the county. About 6 in 10 Maple Grove respondents rated government performance as “good” or better, and up to one-third were ambivalent, rating it as “neither good nor bad.” A majority felt that Maple Grove’s government structure was at least “somewhat” effective, with one-quarter of those saying it was “very” effective. Newer Maple Grove residents were less likely to give positive ratings than longer-term residents when asked to rate aspects of government performance related to citizen representation.

### *Policy Questions*

The survey contained several policy questions about public funds, affordable housing and development. Of the various choices given for spending public funds, residents most supported the preservation of open space, with 6 in 10 showing “strong” support for this idea. Three quarters of respondents supported the idea of the City spending public funds on cultural facilities and affordable housing; there were equal proportions in “strong” support of and in “strong” opposition to the construction of additional affordable housing. Using public funds for a sports facility and an off-leash dog park were at least “somewhat” supported by 6 in 10 respondents.



Again, there were differences in opinion between those who had lived in Maple Grove for more than 10 years and those who were newer residents. Longer-term residents were less likely to support spending money on these new facilities than were newer residents. Opinions about development were mixed among Maple Grove residents who responded to the survey. About half thought that new independent restaurants and other new businesses should be “increased,” while about 4 in 10 preferred the status quo. Residents were less interested in seeing new residential development and new chain restaurants, with about 8 in 10 respondents preferring that Maple Grove “stay the same” or “decrease” these types of development.

### *Participation in the Community*

Maple Grove residents reported partaking in their community’s resources at a relatively high level of engagement. Most respondents had visited a neighborhood park and used the community center in the last year. Most also had read the City newsletter and used the public library. More than half had been to a recycling center, the Farmers Market, a parks and recreation activity or visited the City’s Web site. Half had volunteered in the community during the past year. Two activities were much less frequently reported. Two-thirds of respondents had “never” visited the Arboretum or attended or watched a local public meeting. Most Maple Grove residents are connected to the online community. The majority of respondents reported have high-speed Internet access at home, more than in 2001, though 1 in 10 still said they did not have home Internet access.



### *Full Survey Report*

To view a copy of the complete 2008 Citizen Survey Report, go to the City of Maple Grove’s website at: [www.ci.maple-grove.mn.us](http://www.ci.maple-grove.mn.us)

# The City of Maple Grove 2008 Citizen Survey

TEXT IN CAPS IS INTERVIEWER INSTRUCTIONS ONLY AND IS NOT TO BE READ ALOUD.

Hello, I'm calling on the behalf of the City of Maple Grove. May I speak to the youngest adult 18 or older in the household? Is that you? May I speak with that person?

[ONCE CORRECT PERSON IS ON THE PHONE:] Maple Grove wants to know what you think about your community and City government. We are not trying to sell you anything. Your responses are anonymous and will be reported in group form only to help make decisions about the future of the City.

[REPEAT FIRST PARAGRAPH WITH NEW PERSON.]

1. Do you live within the city limits of the city of Maple Grove?
  1. YES
  2. NO [THANK AND TERMINATE]
  3. DON'T KNOW/REFUSED [THANK AND TERMINATE]
2. Please rate each of the following aspects of quality of life in Maple Grove as very good, good, neither good nor bad, bad or very bad. How would you rate [ROTATE A- D, ALWAYS ASK E LAST]? What about...
  - a. Maple Grove as a place to raise children
  - b. Maple Grove as a place to work
  - c. Maple Grove as a place to retire
  - d. The overall quality of life in Maple Grove

Would you say...[REREAD LIST AS NECESSARY]

1. Very good
  2. Good
  3. Neither good nor bad
  4. Bad
  5. Very bad
  6. DON'T KNOW/REFUSED[DO NOT READ ALOUD]
3. Now, please rate each of the following characteristics as they relate to Maple Grove as a whole, using the options very good, good, neither good nor bad, bad or very bad. How would you rate... [ROTATE A- R]? How about...
  - a. The openness and acceptance of the community towards people of diverse backgrounds
  - b. The cleanliness of Maple Grove
  - c. The variety of housing options
  - d. The overall quality of business and service establishments in Maple Grove
  - e. Recreational opportunities
  - f. Employment opportunities
  - g. Educational opportunities
  - h. Ease of car travel in Maple Grove
  - i. Ease of bus travel in Maple Grove
  - j. Ease of bike travel
  - k. Ease of pedestrian travel
  - l. The availability of paths and walking trails
  - m. The availability of athletic fields
  - n. The availability of affordable housing
  - o. The availability of quality health care
  - p. The preservation of natural areas such as open space and wetlands in Maple Grove
  - q. The quality of Maple Grove lakes
  - r. The overall image or reputation of Maple Grove

Would you say...[REREAD LIST AS NECESSARY]

1. Very good
  2. Good
  3. Neither good nor bad
  4. Bad

5. Very bad
6. DON'T KNOW/REFUSED[DO NOT READ ALOUD]
4. **Please rate how safe or unsafe you feel in each of the following places in Maple Grove. How about [ROTATE PAIRS, A/B, C/D, E/F], do you feel very safe, somewhat safe, neither safe nor unsafe, somewhat unsafe or very unsafe?**
  - a. In your neighborhood during the day
  - b. In your neighborhood after dark
  - c. In Maple Grove's downtown area during the day
  - d. In Maple Grove's downtown area after dark
  - e. In Maple Grove's parks during the day
  - f. In Maple Grove's parks area after dark
  1. Very safe
  2. Somewhat safe
  3. Neither safe nor unsafe
  4. Somewhat unsafe
  5. Very unsafe
  6. DON'T KNOW/REFUSED[DO NOT READ ALOUD]
5. **In the last 12 months, about how many times, if ever, have you or other household members participated in the following activities in Maple Grove? How often have you or other household members... [ROTATE A- L], was it never, once or twice, 3 to 12 times, 13 to 26 times or more than 26 times?**
  - a. Used the Maple Grove public library or its services
  - b. Used the Maple Grove Community Center
  - c. Visited the Arboretum at County Road 30 and Fernbrook
  - d. Participated in a parks and recreation program or activity
  - e. Visited a neighborhood park
  - f. Visited the Maple Grove Farmers' Market
  - g. Attended a meeting of local elected officials or other local public meeting
  - h. Watched a meeting of local elected officials or other local public meeting on cable television
  - i. Read Maple Grove Newsletter
  - j. Visited the City of Maple Grove Web site (at [www.ci.maple-grove.mn.us](http://www.ci.maple-grove.mn.us))
  - k. Visited a recycling center
  - l. Volunteered your time to some group or activity in Maple Grove
  1. Never
  2. Once or twice
  3. 3 to 12 times
  4. 13 to 26 times
  5. More than 26 times
  6. DON'T KNOW/REFUSED[DO NOT READ ALOUD]
6. **Please tell me whether the quality of each of the following services in Maple Grove is very good, good, neither good nor bad, bad or very bad. How about [ROTATE A- W]?**
  - a. Police services
  - b. Fire services
  - c. Crime prevention
  - d. Fire prevention and education
  - e. Traffic enforcement
  - f. Street repair and maintenance
  - g. Street lighting
  - h. Snow removal
  - i. Sidewalk maintenance
  - j. Traffic signal timing
  - k. Bus or transit services
  - l. Recycling
  - m. Drinking water
  - n. Sewer services



- o. City parks and trails
- p. Recreation programs or classes
- q. Athletic fields
- r. Maple Grove Community Center, which includes a pool, ice arena, the Maple Maze, meeting rooms and a teen center
- s. Land use, planning and zoning
- t. Code enforcement, such as weeds, abandoned buildings, etc.
- u. Animal control
- v. Services to seniors
- w. Services to youth

- 1. Very good
- 2. Good
- 3. Neither good nor bad
- 4. Bad
- 5. Very bad
- 6. DON'T KNOW/REFUSED[DO NOT READ ALOUD]

**7. Overall, how would you rate the quality of the services provided by the City of Maple Grove? Would you say...**

- 1. Very good
- 2. Good
- 3. Neither good nor bad
- 4. Bad
- 5. Very bad
- 6. DON'T KNOW/REFUSED[DO NOT READ ALOUD]

**8. As you know, Maple Grove is governed by its Mayor and City Council. How effective or ineffective do you think this type of structure is?**

- 1. Very effective
- 2. Somewhat effective
- 3. Somewhat ineffective
- 4. Very ineffective
- 5. DON'T KNOW/REFUSED[DO NOT READ ALOUD]

**9. Please rate the following categories of Maple Grove government performance. [ROTATE A-F.] How would you rate...**

- a. The value of services for the taxes paid to Maple Grove
- b. The overall direction that Maple Grove is taking
- c. The job Maple Grove government does welcoming citizen involvement
- d. The job Maple Grove government does listening to citizens
- e. The job Maple Grove City Council does representing its citizens
- f. The job Maple Grove City Council does responding to citizen concerns

Would you say...[REREAD LIST AS NECESSARY]

- 1. Very good
- 2. Good
- 3. Neither good nor bad
- 4. Bad
- 5. Very bad
- 6. DON'T KNOW/REFUSED[DO NOT READ ALOUD]

**10. How likely or unlikely are you to:**

- a. Recommend living in Maple Grove to someone? Would you say...
  - b. How likely or unlikely are you to remain in Maple Grove for the next five years? Would you say...
- 1. Very likely
  - 2. Somewhat likely
  - 3. Somewhat unlikely
  - 4. Very unlikely
  - 5. DON'T KNOW/REFUSED[DO NOT READ ALOUD]

**11. When you think about living in Maple Grove, please tell me how important, if at all, each of the following is to the quality of life here. How about the [ROTATE A- K]? Would you say...**

- a. Quality of the neighborhoods
- b. Quality of the housing
- c. Cost of the housing
- d. Quality of the schools
- e. Community amenities
- f. Small town and rural feel
- g. Proximity to your place of work
- h. Safety of the community
- i. Open spaces and parks
- j. Proximity to family or friends
- k. Ease of travel throughout the City

- 1. Essential
- 2. Very important
- 3. Somewhat important
- 4. Not important at all
- 5. DON'T KNOW/REFUSED[DO NOT READ ALOUD]

**12. For each of the following, please tell me whether you think Maple Grove has done a very good, good, neither good nor bad, bad or very bad job of planning. How about [ROTATE A- L, ALWAYS ASK M LAST]?**

- a. Roads
- b. Park- and- Ride Lots
- c. Trails and sidewalks
- d. Open space
- e. Parks
- f. Parking
- g. Retail and shopping areas
- h. Industrial areas
- i. Residential areas
- j. Recent housing development
- k. Attracting employers with professional and executive jobs to Maple Grove
- l. Community events, such as Maple Grove Days
- m. Overall city planning

- 1. Very good
- 2. Good
- 3. Neither good nor bad
- 4. Bad
- 5. Very bad
- 6. DON'T KNOW/REFUSED[DO NOT READ ALOUD]

**13. Which of the following types of Internet access do you have at home?**

1. NONE [DO NOT READ ALOUD]
2. High speed, (broadband, such as DSL or cable Internet)
3. Dial- up
4. DON'T KNOW/REFUSED [DO NOT READ ALOUD]

**14. To what extent do you support or oppose the City of Maple Grove considering spending public funds on each of the following? What about...[ROTATE A- E.]**

- a. Cultural and arts facilities
- b. Off- leash dog park
- c. A sports dome / field house for use during the winter
- d. Preservation of open space areas
- e. Affordable housing

Would you say you...[REREAD SCALE AS NECESSARY]...the City of Maple Grove spending public funds for this?

1. Strongly support
2. Somewhat support
3. Somewhat oppose
4. Strongly oppose
5. DON'T KNOW/REFUSED [DO NOT READ ALOUD]

**15. To what extent do you support or oppose the construction of additional housing in Maple Grove for low to moderate income residents?**

1. Strongly support
2. Somewhat support
3. Somewhat oppose
4. Strongly oppose
5. DON'T KNOW/REFUSED [DO NOT READ ALOUD]

**16. For each of the following, please tell me whether you think that Maple Grove should encourage the rate of this type of development to increase, stay the same or decrease? How about... [ROTATE Q- H]?**

- a. New retail development
- b. Redevelopment of existing retail areas
- c. New residential development
- d. Land development in general
- e. New businesses and corporations, using office and industrial space
- f. New chain or franchise restaurants
- g. New independent or non- franchise restaurants
- h. New entertainment centers

Should the rate of this type of development...

1. Increase
2. Stay the same
3. Decrease
4. DON'T KNOW/REFUSED [DO NOT READ ALOUD]

**17. What is the single biggest challenge facing the City of Maple Grove right now? [ALLOW ONLY ONE ANSWER.]**

1. ACCESSIBILITY
2. AFFORDABLE HOUSING NOT ENOUGH
3. AIR POLLUTION
4. BALANCING BETWEEN MAINTAINING SMALL TOWN ATMOSPHERE AND GROWTH
5. COST OF UTILITIES (SUCH AS GAS OR WATER)
6. CRIME
7. CRIME
8. EXPANSION AND DEVELOPMENT
9. GROWTH - TOO LITTLE - JOBS
10. GROWTH - TOO LITTLE - POPULATION
11. GROWTH - TOO LITTLE - RETAIL, SUCH AS STORES OR RESTAURANTS
12. GROWTH - TOO MUCH - JOBS
13. GROWTH - TOO MUCH - POPULATION
14. GROWTH - TOO MUCH - RETAIL, SUCH AS STORES OR RESTAURANTS
15. NOISE
16. PARKS AND OPEN SPACE - NOT ENOUGH
17. SCHOOLS - GENERAL/CLASSROOM OVERCROWDING
18. SCHOOLS - POOR QUALITY OF EDUCATION
19. TAXES - TOO HIGH
20. TAXES - TOO LOW
21. TRANSPORTATION - ADDITIONAL TRAFFIC AND ROADS
22. TRANSPORTATION - TRAFFIC CONGESTION
23. TRANSPORTATION - BUSES, OTHER TRANSIT
98. OTHER [SPECIFY]
99. DON'T KNOW/REFUSED[DO NOT READ ALOUD]

**My last questions are about you and your household. Again, all of your responses to this survey are completely anonymous and will be reported in group form only.**

**D1. How many years have you lived in Maple Grove? Is it...**

1. Less than 2 years
2. 2- 5 years
3. 6- 10 years
4. 11- 20 years
5. More than 20 years
6. DON'T KNOW/REFUSED[DO NOT READ ALOUD]

**D2. Which of the following best describes the building you live in? Is it...**

1. A one family house detached from any other houses
2. A house attached to one or more houses (such as a duplex or townhome)
3. A building with two or more apartments or condominiums
4. Some other type of building
5. DON'T KNOW/REFUSED[DO NOT READ ALOUD]

**D3. Do you rent or own your home?**

1. Rent
2. Own
3. DON'T KNOW/REFUSED[DO NOT READ ALOUD]

**D4. How many children under 18 live in your household?**

- [ENTER NUMBER]  
999. DON'T KNOW/REFUSED [DO NOT READ ALOUD]

**D5. How many members of your household are aged 60 or older?**

- [ENTER NUMBER]  
999. DON'T KNOW/REFUSED [DO NOT READ ALOUD]

**D6. Please stop me when I reach the category that includes your household's total income before taxes for 2007. Be sure to include in your total income money from all sources for all persons living in your household. Is it...**

1. Less than \$25,000
2. \$25,000 to less than \$50,000
3. \$50,000 to less than \$100,000
4. \$100,000 to less than \$150,000
5. \$150,000 or more
6. DON'T KNOW/REFUSED[DO NOT READ ALOUD]

**D7. Do you consider yourself to be Spanish, Hispanic or Latino?**

1. Yes
2. No
3. DON'T KNOW/REFUSED[DO NOT READ ALOUD]

**D8. Which one or more of the following would you say is your race? [MULTIPLE RESPONSE. PROBE.]**

1. American Indian or Alaskan Native
2. Asian, Asian Indian or Pacific Islander
3. Black or African American
4. White
5. Other
6. DON'T KNOW/REFUSED[DO NOT READ ALOUD]

**D9. Stop me when I reach the category that includes your age.**

1. 18- 24 years old
2. 25- 34 years old
3. 35- 44 years old
4. 45- 54 years old
5. 55- 64 years old
6. 65- 74 years old
7. 75 years or older
8. DON'T KNOW/REFUSED[DO NOT READ ALOUD]

**D10. DO NOT ASK. RECORD SEX OF RESPONDENT AFTER INTERVIEW IS COMPLETE.**

1. Female
2. Male

**Thank you very much for your time. Your answers will help the City of Maple Grove make decisions that affect your community.**

## The City of Maple Grove 2008 Citizen Survey – Final Disposition Report

The final dispositions of the numbers dialed during the survey are listed in the table below. A total of 2,557 phone numbers were dialed during the survey administration. Some of these numbers are considered ineligible<sup>1</sup> for the survey. Of the approximately 1,131 households called, 401 completed interviews providing a response rate of 35%. Approximately 223 households refused the survey.

Disposition of all Numbers Called for the 2008 City of Maple Grove, MN Citizen Survey	
Complete	401
Partial	0
Refusal and breakoff	7
Refusal	216
Respondent never available	52
Answering machine household-no message left	223
Language problem	35
Scheduled call-back	11
Always busy	7
No answer	413
Call blocking	0
Out of sample - other strata than originally coded	289
Fax/data line	175
Disconnected number	475
Cell phone	0
Business, government office, other organizations	253
<b>Total phone numbers used</b>	<b>2,557</b>
I=Complete Interviews	401
P=Partial Interviews	0
R=Refusal and break off	223
NC=Non Contact	275
O=Other	46
e <sup>2</sup> =estimated proportion of cases of unknown eligibility that are eligible	44%
UH=Unknown household	420
UO=Unknown other	0
Response Rate <sup>3</sup>	35%

<sup>1</sup> Disconnected, fax/data line, or business phone numbers were not included as eligible households. For 420 phone numbers where the eligibility status of the household was unknown, 44% were estimated to be eligible. This proportion was assumed to hold for those households not contacted, or where the household refused, and therefore prevented knowing the eligibility status, and only 44% of these numbers were included in the final response rate calculation.

<sup>2</sup> Estimate of e is based on proportion of eligible households among all numbers for which a definitive determination of status was obtained (a very conservative estimate).

<sup>3</sup> The response rate was calculated as  $I / ((I+P) + (R+NC+O) + e(UH+UO))$ .

**CAC 2008 Survey - Completed Calls By Phone Prefix**

<u>Prefix</u>	<u>Calls</u>
315	9
391	3
416	59
420	153
424	32
425	57
493	11
494	<u>77</u>
<b>Total</b>	<b>401</b>

## **Other Business and Updates**



## Area Reports

**AREA REPORT**  
**Maple Grove Citizens Advisory Committee**

*Please use this form to express your concerns,  
suggestions, and positive comments on things you see  
taking place in Maple Grove!*

**Name:** \_\_\_\_\_ (Required)

**Date:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Phone:** \_\_\_\_\_ (Please include if responding party has  
any questions)

**Comment:** \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

**Comment:** \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

**Comment:** \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

**Submit your completed form to Mike Opatz at the monthly CAC meeting. Area Reports will  
be submitted to the appropriate City staff/department, and a response will be in a future CAC  
agenda packet.**